



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,150	06/15/2001	Ralf Mimoun	BUNGA-57762	8166

24201 7590 10/05/2004

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE
TENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

THAI, CUONG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,150

Applicant(s)

MIMOUN, RALF

Examiner

CUONG T THAI

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on April/30/04 Amendment.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2173

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Amendment filed on April/30/2004.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.
3. The informal drawing has been approved by the Examiner. However, Applicants need to formally submit it.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 4, 9-11, 14, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (USPN: 5,892,905) hereinafter Brandt in view of Farris et al. (USPN: 6,167,253) hereinafter Farris.

As per claims 1 (method), 18 (readable medium), and 21 (system), Brandt discloses a method for creating a user interface for a standard application in the window of the browser that runs on a personal computer workstation of a computer network and at least one user works with the standard application from the personal computer workstation over the computer network wherein the standard application can be serviced by means of a user interface and works results from the standard application can be returned through the output fields of the user interface as

Art Unit: 2173

the technique of providing access to software applications over the WWW, and the current limitations of existing solutions provides the capability to easily access many different application programs over the WWW via a standardized GUI (see col. 3, lines 56-60) includes Web browser 212 is a software program running on the client workstation 210 that allows a user at a client workstation 210 to communicate with other computers over connection 216 (see col. 5, lines 52-54), said method comprising:

Presenting separate components of the user interface of the user interface of the standard application in the browser of the personal computer workstation is taught by Brandt as the technique of common WWW user interface components such as HTML templates/ forms that can address a majority of typical application processing input and output requirements (see col. 9, lines 45-47), and requires the user to input a user ID and password in order to gain access to CGI 420 (see col. 13, lines 66-67).

Brandt, however, does not disclose the limitation of converting the state and function of the separate components into standard code that can be interpreted by the browser, transmitting the standard code to the browser for display as the user interface and transferring to the standard application in the requested format that data entered by the user through the user interface and returned by the browser.

Farris discloses the limitation of converting the state and function of the separate components into standard code that can be interpreted by the browser, transmitting the standard code to the browser for display as the user interface, and transferring to the standard application in the requested format that data entered by the user through the user interface and returned by the browser as the techniques of perform any format conversion necessary between signal

Art Unit: 2173

formats utilized by the network and signal formats used within MAPOD 2d (see col. 19, lines 36-36), the main cell page monitor 34 receives the main cell page and rebroadcasts the page so that the mobile telephone located in the off-load cellular system will receive the main cell page (see col. 28, lines 26-29), the call delivery process is a standard function of the IS-41 interface specification (see col. 28, lines 34-35), and the typical home page returned to the browser is formatted using HTML (see col. 40, lines 51-52).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Farris' teaching of converting the state and function of the separate components into standard code that can be interpreted by the browser, transmitting the standard code to the browser for display as the user interface, and transferring to the standard application in the requested format that data entered by the user through the user interface and returned by the browser into that of Brandt's invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by, capable of performing format conversion from any format into standard format of standard application program interface prior to download and display it to an end user's user interface.

As per claim 2, the limitation of wherein the separate components include list boxes, input fields and output fields is taught by Brandt as the technique of common WWW user interface components such as HTML templates/ forms that can address a majority of typical application processing input and output requirements (see col.9, lines 45-47), a button presented in an HTML generated user interface (see col. 19, lines 65-66), a button presented on an HTML form (see col. 20, line 1), and requires the user to input a user ID and password in order to gain

Art Unit: 2173

access to CGI 420 (see col. 13, lines 66-67). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 3, Brandt discloses the claimed limitations presenting in the browser window the information for drawing the corresponding graphic component, and returning to the server the information about the user input corresponding to the graphic components with respect to claim 1 above. Brandt fails to disclose the limitation of interpreting as graphic the components not recognized.

Farris discloses the limitation of interpreting as graphic the components not recognized as the technique of selection device having capability to present a limited amount of graphical information to the user (see col. 19, lines 21-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Farris' teaching of interpreting as graphic the components not recognized into that of Brandt's invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of interpreting limited information as graphic components to an end user.

As per claim 4, the limitation of wherein the standard code comprises HTML code is taught by Brandt as the technique of HTML templates/forms that can address a majority of typical application processing input and output requirement (see col. 9, lines 44-46). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2173

As per claim 11, Brandt discloses most of this claim with respect to claim 1. The citation of "on request by the user through the browser" is taught by Brandt as the technique of the user can enter a URL for a specific home page site or click on a button presented in an HTML generated user interface using web browser 212 (see col. 19, lines 64-67). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 12, the limitation of wherein the server has management software installed which can be called by other server either directly or through a program that can run independently (CGI) and which makes available the server functions with application character is taught by Brandt as the technique of if the user requested information requires access to FlowMark application 342, there will be a command embedded in the data stream that identifies the need to access CGI 420, which will, in turn, provide access to FlowMark application 342 (see col. 20, lines 10-14). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 13, the limitation of wherein the management software checks the access rights of the user when the processes the incoming requests is taught by Brandt as the technique of the REALM request is a well-known software security feature which requires the user to input a user ID and password in order to gain access to CGI (see col. 13, lines 65-67) and FMIG 430 compares the user ID and key with those in user library 620 (see col. 14, lines 9-11). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2173

As per claim 14, the limitation of wherein in order to build a network capability when several requests for a standard application have to be processed, the management software starts once the standard application for each request is taught by Brandt as the technique of this is the preferred method where control of access is not a primary concern. For example, embedded the key in the HTML form would be useful if the submitted HTML form is one used by visitors or guests to access limited functions of the software application (see col. 13, lines 37-41). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 9, Brandt discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Frank, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the data returned by the browser are assigned to the corresponding components.

Farris discloses the limitation of wherein the data returned by the browser are assigned to the corresponding components as the technique of the typical home page returned to the browser is formatted using HTML (see col. 40, lines 51-52) and when a browser encounters an img tag, it send another request to the server to download the named image (see col. 40, lines 54-56).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Farris' teaching of wherein the data returned by the browser are assigned to the corresponding components into that of Brandt's invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of returned requested data to the corresponding demanded components and displayed to an end user.

Art Unit: 2173

As per claim 10, Brandt discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Frank, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the assignment of the data to the components is done by operating system routines.

Farris discloses the limitation of wherein the assignment of the data to the components is done by operating system routines as the technique of the downloaded operating system software stored in the system memory of the transceiver would control operations of the digital signal processor to send and receive signals in accord with the particular network the subscriber chooses to connect with transceiver (see col. 19 line 65 to col. 20 line 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Farris' teaching of wherein the assignment of the data to the components is done by operating system routines into that of Brandt's invention. By doing so, the system's operating routines would be enhanced by capable of returned requested data to the corresponding demanded components and displayed to an end user.

6. Claims 5, 15-17 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (USPN: 5,892,905) hereinafter Brandt in view of Farris et al. (USPN: 6,167,253) hereinafter Farris and further in view of Chen et al. (USPN: 6,507,856).

As per claim 5, Brandt-Farris disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Brandt-Farris, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the standard code comprises XML code.

Chen discloses the limitation of wherein the standard code comprises XML code as the technique of XML document to provide tag name and value information (see col. 2, lines 26-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chen's XML document format into that of Brandt-Farris combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing extensible language to the Web wherein the user can rely on.

As per claims 15-16, Brandt-Farris disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Brandt-Farris, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the code generated contains script routines that can be interpreted by the browser (see claim 15) and script routines are Java-Script routines (see claim 16).

Chen discloses the limitation of wherein the code generated contains Java-Script routines that can be interpreted by the browser as the technique of the style sheet written in Java-Script provide a way to render the XML document to a browser (see col. 5, lines 11-14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chen's the code generated contains Java-Script routines that can be interpreted by the browser into that of Brandt-Farris combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing a render way to the style sheet written in XML document to the Web browser's end user.

As per claims 19-20, due to the similarity of each of these claims to that of claims 15-16, these claims are therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claims 15-16.

As per claim 17, Brandt-Farris disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Brandt-Farris, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the software module is generated according to the CSS standard.

Chen discloses the limitation of wherein the software module is generated according to the CSS standard as the technique of CSS provides a way to render the XML document to a browser (see col. 5, lines 12-14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Chen's wherein the software module is generated according to the CSS standard into that of Brandt-Farris combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing a render way to the style sheet written in XML document to the Web browser's end user.

7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (USPN: 5,892,905) hereinafter Brandt in view of Farris et al. (USPN: 6,167,253) hereinafter Farris and further in view of Morscheck et al. (USPN: 6,076,080 hereinafter Morscheck.

As per claim 6, Brandt-Farris disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Brandt-Farris, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein along with the coordinates of the components of the interface of the standard application also their size, color, and in the case of text components also the type of type face and font size are investigated and transferred to the browser.

Morscheck discloses the limitation of the components of the interface of including their size, color, and in the case of text components also the type of type face and font size as the technique of binding color (see col. 17 line 15), the size will be populated by that design but the paper weight/color/ description must be entered (see col. 17, lines 55-56), and a user can specify the orientation of the printing. Options include horizontal and vertical. Clicking a number of Lines drop down list arrow allows a user to specify the number of lines required for the custom title. A font size must be selected for a custom title (see col. 22, lines 10-14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Morscheck teaching of components of the interface of including their size, color, and in the case of text components also the type of type face and font size into that of Brandt user interface of standard application and further into that of Brandt-Farris combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of providing look and feel to the standard application on user workstation.

As per claim 7, Brandt-Farris disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Brandt-Farris, however, does not disclose the limitation of investigating the coordinates of the position of every component on the user interface and on the basis of these coordinates drawing the components in the browser in a manner that is identical or similar to their positioning on the user interface of the standard application.

Morscheck discloses the limitation of investigating the coordinates of the position of every component on the user interface and on the basis of these coordinates drawing the components in the browser in a manner that is identical or similar to their positioning on the user

Art Unit: 2173

interface of the standard application as the technique of the forms order entry system is programmed to determined manufacturability and usability of an order or quote by comparing the form order design data to a set of validation rules and routing manufacturability and usability exceptions to a selected one of a plurality of exception handling locations (see col. 1, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Morscheck teaching of investigating the coordinates of the position of every component on the user interface and on the basis of these coordinates drawing the components in the browser in a manner that is identical or similar to their positioning on the user interface of the standard application into that of Brandt-Farris combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of comparing and investigating the identical and similarity of components on user's graphical workstation.

As per claim 8, due to the similarity of this claim to that of claim 7, this claim is therefore rejected for the same reason applied to claim 7.

8. Applicant's argument filed on April/30/2004 have been fully reconsidered, but they are not persuasive.

On the second paragraph of page 9, Applicant argues that "Farris et al. does not teach the missing feature". The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since Farris discloses the missing features of "converting the state and function of the separate components into standard code that can be interpreted by the browser, transmitting the standard code to the

Art Unit: 2173

browser for display as the user interface, and transferring to the standard application in the requested format that data entered by the user through the user interface and returned by the browser” as the techniques of perform any format conversion necessary between signal formats utilized by the network and signal formats used within MAPOD 2d (see col. 19, lines 36-36), the main cell page monitor 34 receives the main cell page and rebroadcasts the page so that the mobile telephone located in the off-load cellular system will receive the main cell page (see col. 28, lines 26-29), the call delivery process is a standard function of the IS-41 interface specification (see col. 28, lines 34-35), and the typical home page returned to the browser is formatted using HTML (see col. 40, lines 51-52).

Still on this same paragraph, Applicant argues that “ even if Farris did teach the missing feature, there is no suggestion in either Brandt et al. or Farris et al. to make such combination and, in fact, the context within which the Brandt et al. apparatus is presented, actually discourages any such combination”. The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since as indicated by the Examiner that “It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Farris’ teaching of converting the state and function of the separate components into standard code that can be interpreted by the browser, transmitting the standard code to the browser for display as the user interface, and transferring to the standard application in the requested format that data entered by the user through the user interface and returned by the browser into that of Brandt’s invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by capable of performing format conversion from any format into standard format of standard application program interface prior to download and display to an end user’s user interface.

Art Unit: 2173

On the third paragraph of page 9, Applicant argues that "The teaching of Farris et al. relate little, to user interfaces and are entirely unrelated to the creation of a user interface for a standard application in the window of a browser". The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument since Farris's mobile, land based user allow user to download web relate information and Internet related information via one or more of the Internet, ADSL, mobile, land-based user, service provider.

On the fifth paragraph of page 10, Applicant argues that "Applicant submits that neither Brandt et al. or Farris et al. either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention claimed in independent claims 1, 18 and 21. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration of the 103 rejections of these claims and their respective dependent claims. The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument. Independent claims 1, 18 and 21 and their respective dependent claims are rejected for at least for the reasons as set forth above.

On the first paragraph of page 11, Applicant argues that " in view of the foregoing analysis of independent claims 1, 18 and 21 in view of Brandt et al. and Farris et al., Applicant believes that the rejection under 103 are rendered moot as dependent claims 5, 15-17 and 18-20 depend from allowable independent claims". The Examiner, however, does not agree to this argument. Claims 5, 15-17 and 18-20 are rejected due to their dependencies upon rejected based claims 1, 18, and 21.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2173

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG T THAI whose telephone number is (703) 308-7234 through the month of October, 2004 and at (571) 272-4056 thereafter. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeça can be reached on (703) 308-3116 through the month of October, 2004 and at (571) 272-4048 thereafter. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2173

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CUONG T THAI
Examiner
Art Unit 2173

September 30, 2004



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173